

R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 003 643

56

A SEQUENCE OF PROPOSED RESEARCH DESIGNS RELATING PROGRAM
STRUCTURE TO RESISTANCE TO ETV. EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION
PROJECT, PRELIMINARY REPORT 3.

BY- SHEPHERD, JOHN R. SCHEIDEL, THOMAS M.

OREGON UNIV., EUGENE, INST. FOR COMMUNITY STUDIES

REPORT NUMBER NDEA-VIIA-109-3

PUB DATE 1 SEP 61

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.18 HC-\$2.92 73P.

DESCRIPTORS- *EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION, *PROGRAMS, *RESEARCH
METHODOLOGY, *PRODUCTION TECHNIQUES, TELEVISION VIEWING,
TELEVISION CURRICULUM, PROGRAM EVALUATION, *ADULT PROGRAMS,
EUGENE, OREGON

THE FRAMES OF REFERENCE FROM WHICH THE EXPERIMENTAL
DESIGNS WERE DISCUSSED WERE--(1) THE PRODUCER (AND HIS
SITUATION) IN THE STATION AND (2) THE VIEWER (AND HIS
PERCEPTION) OF EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION PROGRAM (ETV)
STRUCTURE. ETV PROGRAM STRUCTURE, PROGRAM ORIGINATORS, AND
THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS WERE STUDIED TO DETERMINE THE
INFLUENCE OF PROGRAM STRUCTURE ON VIEWERS. THE RESPONSE
VARIABLES OF THE AUDIENCE, DIFFERING EVALUATIONS, AWARENESS
OF (OR LACK OF) PROGRAM STRUCTURE, AND THE AUDIENCE'S
SPECIFICITY OF PERCEPTIONS WERE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.
EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN PROCEDURES AND INSTRUMENTS WERE INCLUDED
IN THE REPORT FOR EACH OF THE SIX PROPOSED RESEARCH STUDIES.
RELATED REPORTS ARE ED 003 242, ED 003 243, AND ED 003 641
THROUGH ED 003 645. (HB)

ED003643

109-3

the institute for community studies
studies in resistances to cultural innovations

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION PROJECT PRELIMINARY REPORT NUMBER 3

a sequence of proposed research designs relating
program structure to resistance to ETV
j. r. shepherd • t. m. scheidel • university of oregon

~~REPRODUCED FROM THE~~
~~OFFICE OF EDUCATION~~
~~REPRODUCED FROM THE~~
~~OFFICE OF EDUCATION~~
~~REPRODUCED FROM THE~~
~~OFFICE OF EDUCATION~~

The Institute for Community Studies
Studies in Resistances to Cultural Innovations

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Start →
EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION PROJECT

PRELIMINARY REPORT NUMBER THREE

A Sequence of Proposed Research Designs Relating
Program Structure to Resistance to ETV — —

John R. Shepherd,
Associate Professor,
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon

Thomas M. Scheidel,
Assistant Professor,
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

Issued: September 1, 1961

ED003643

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART ONE:	INTRODUCTION	Page 1 - 13
-----------	--------------	-------------

Acknowledgements

In a very real sense this report is the result of the efforts not only of the authors listed but of all the members of the Project staff. Each of the following has made a contribution:

Robert S. Cahill, Research Fellow, 1959-
(Doctoral candidate in Political Science)

Marshall N. Goldstein, Director, March 1961-
(Instructor in Political Science)

PART TWO: Donald W. Knoepfler, Research Fellow, 1960-61
(Doctoral candidate in Speech)

Walter T. Martin, Director, November 1959-March 1961
(Professor of Sociology)

Martin Meissner, Research Fellow, 1959-61
(Doctoral candidate in Sociology)

This report was made possible through a grant from the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under Title VII of the National Defense Education Act.

PART THREE:	THE SURVEY AND ITS PROGRAM STRUCTURE	13 - 22
-------------	--------------------------------------	---------

Study III A: "Do TV laws and regulatory acts
affecting operations of TV program structure?"

Study III B: "How aware of television program
structure are television viewers?"

Study III C: "Are specific law classes
perceptions of television program structure?"

PART FOUR:	SUMMARY	22 - 23
------------	---------	---------

APPENDICES		24 - 65
------------	-------	---------

Appendix A: "Questionnaire and attitude items
suggested for study proposal II B"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART ONE:	INTRODUCTION	Page 1 - 13
	Definition of Terms	1
	"ETV"	1
	"Resistance"	2
	"Program Structure"	3
	"Laboratory Study"	5
	The Need for this Report	6
	Some Empirical Data	8
	Summary of Objectives	13
PART TWO:	THE PRODUCER AND ETV PROGRAM STRUCTURE	14 - 32
	<u>Study II A:</u> "What are the elements of ETV program structure?"	15
	<u>Study II B:</u> "Who are the program originators in educational television?"	24
	<u>Study II C:</u> "What are the dynamics of the decision-making process in the development of program structure?"	30
PART THREE:	THE AUDIENCE AND ETV PROGRAM STRUCTURE	33 - 41
	<u>Study III A:</u> "Do ETV fans and resisters make differing evaluations of ETV program structure?"	35
	<u>Study III B:</u> "How aware of television program structure are television viewers?"	38
	<u>Study III C:</u> "How specific are viewers' perceptions of television program structure	39
PART FOUR:	SUMMARY	42 - 45
APPENDICES		46 - 65
	<u>Appendix A:</u> "Questionnaire and attitude items suggested for study proposal II B"	47

Appendix B: "Scales for study proposal III A" . . . 57

Appendix C: "Viewer's program check list" 58

Appendix D: "Variables proposed for study
proposal III C" 62

Appendix E: "Sample for answer booklet for study
proposal III C" 64

TABLE I . . . Comparison of KQED-TV and Commercial

TABLE II . . . Categories and Units for Analysis of
Production Factors in KTV Program
Structure 13

TABLE III . . . Major Lines of Inquiry to Determine
Attributes of KTV Program Originators . . . 57

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
TABLE I . . .	Comparison of KOAC-TV and Commercial Station Programming	17
TABLE II . . .	Categories and Units for Analysis of Production Factors in ETV Program Structure	19
TABLE III . .	Major Lines of Inquiry to Determine Attributes of ETV Program Originators . .	27

It should be clear at the outset that our attempt here will be limited to those directions which we feel have been indicated in our previous work. It would be presumptuous to suggest that we could possibly cover all of the fruitful avenues of research which have been opened to us in our investigation of the areas of resistance to educational television. We do feel it is possible, however, to make some suggestions which go beyond the field surveys we have already conducted, and which may point the way for more precise measurements of certain factors which we have observed in the field. This brief introduction aims to present to the reader the conditions under which this report should be read. It constitutes a rationale for what we propose in the main body of the report, as well as provides certain necessities, such as definitions of terms, which will be essential for clarity.

Definition of Terms:

ETV: By ETV we mean those programs which are broadcast for public consumption by a non-commercial educational television station. We mean to exclude programs broadcast expressly for

Part I

INTRODUCTION

The primary purpose of this report is to outline a series of related research designs intended to assess the relationship between program production, program content, and resistance to educational television. Lest the scope of this report seem too inclusive to the reader it should be clear at the outset that our attempt here will be limited to those directions which we feel have been indicated in our previous work. It would be presumptuous to suggest that we could possibly cover all of the fruitful avenues of research which have been opened to us in our investigation of the areas of resistance to educational television. We do feel it is possible, however, to make some suggestions which go beyond the field surveys we have already conducted, and which may point the way for more precise measurements of certain factors which we have observed in the field. This brief introduction aims to present to the reader the conditions under which this report should be read. It constitutes a rationale for what we propose in the main body of the report, as well as provides certain necessities, such as definitions of terms, which will be essential for clarity.

Definition of Terms:

ETV: By ETV we mean those programs which are broadcast for public consumption by a non-commercial educational television station.

We mean to exclude programs broadcast expressly for

use in the classroom. While we recognize that many cultural programs carried by commercial broadcasting stations can be labeled "educational," for the purposes of this report we mean to exclude such programs from our definition. If we anticipate recommending changes in programming for the sake of some experiment, we can only hope to do this where the opportunity is present. There is some question whether such control could be exerted in connection with an educational station; there seems to be little question that it could not be in the case of a commercial station. Another reason for this definition is that we have accepted the definitions of our earlier studies and analyses in order to have those data available. It would seem that by confining our consideration to those programs and productions originating in the educational television station, we have taken advantage of the situation in which the proposed studies might be conducted, made best use of the available data, and yet have not seriously limited the scope of the area in which we may work.

Resistance: For the purposes of this report, we shall take "resistance" to designate the behavior of those individuals either who do not view station KOAC-TV, the educational television channel available to them, or who express a negative attitude toward educational television in general (apart from their particular attitude toward KOAC-TV), or who demonstrate a combination of these attitudes. We

mean to suggest that any individual who does not accept what is offered to him on the educational television channel should be considered a resister. There is an obvious question of degree involved in this definition, and the reader will might wonder how resistant the individual need be before he can be so counted. We suggest that this question may best be answered in terms of the conditions of each of the designs under consideration. Such an operational definition, allowing some margin for degrees of resistance, rather than an arbitrary decision at this point, is more meaningful and will be more useful in actual practice.

Program Structure: It seems to us that there is a logical and a dynamic reason why we must consider program content and program production as a duality, rather than attempt to treat these factors as discrete variables. The term means to include all production aspects, all content aspects, and their interaction. Clearly this is an operational definition designed to help us avoid the useless repetition of terms such as "content," "production variables," and the like. We do see that in some research situations it will be desirable and necessary to separate elements and to consider them as research variables. However, it is our thought that the proper place for the attempt to make this separation is not in the presentation of the stimuli to the subject. Experiments in which this is done seem to be somewhat unrealistic and artificial. It seems more appropriate to

make this separation when observing reception of the stimuli by the subjects. In addition to the reasons above, we feel this definition can be defended on the basis of what is observed as the program is fed into the camera. This process welds the subject matter and techniques together so that we find it virtually impossible to think of production as being disassociated from content. Without content, production techniques simply do not exist. We are aware of the fact that this duality carries with it some inherent problems in terms of application to research procedures. For instance, MacLean's studies¹ indicate this separation is a difficult task to accomplish on the reaction level; that is, that viewers have difficulty in separating the two. We hope to propose designs which will make it possible for the researcher interested in differentiating between content and production to do so. As we plan the proposed designs, however, we mean to think of these two factors in the combined form. It should also be stated here that while we employ this broad understanding of program structure, our research interests will focus somewhat on television production techniques. We take this position for two reasons. First, it would seem that the opportunities to effect changes in program production are far greater than they

1. M.S. MacLean, Jr., E. Crane, and D. F. Kiel, "What Makes an Educational Television Program Interesting?" In Schramm, Wilbur, editor, The Impact of Educational Television, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 1960.

are with program subject matter. If one changes subject matter markedly he changes the very nature of educational television. This would not be the case with marked differences in production techniques. Second, it has always been understood to be the function of a communicator that he adapt the presentation of his subject matter to his audience. His freedom is not so much in subject area, but rather in the selection of materials and in the techniques of presentation.

Laboratory Study: This term is neither so crucial nor so fundamental as the terms previously defined. It is included here only to insure that others reading our work will not be surprised by the scope of the studies proposed. By "laboratory study" we mean to include not only those designs executed within the confines of the studio, but also those done in the field under relatively controlled conditions. We see there is much to commend keeping the viewing situation as "natural" as possible. Accordingly, we will not feel bound in our proposals always to bring the subjects into the studio. Hence the definition of "laboratory" as any place where we bring subjects together for exposure to program structures under relatively controlled conditions. While we anticipate there are some instances in which it would be essential to bring subjects into a closed-circuit television laboratory, we also believe we can see occasions when it would be wise to anticipate research designs being accomplished under less rigorous conditions.

The Need For This Report:

The literature relating to educational television abounds with references to the need for research. Anyone who has worked in this area is acutely aware of the limitations of present research and the need for more and better research on certain aspects. It seems to us, therefore, that the injunction is upon us to show how what we are attempting to do in this report fits the research needs in educational television.

Each of the proposals which follows deals with a unique area of interest, i.e., program structure and resistance to educational television: As stated in our application to the United States Office of Health, Education, and Welfare,

Most studies have dealt with the positive aspects of acceptance and use of audio-visual media. Comparatively little attention has been given to the negative aspects of indifference, resistance, and rejection. It is our contention that a study of resistances to the use of these media for educational purposes is basic to the problem of acceptance and more effective utilization.¹

Nothing has been found during the course of our work thus far which alters this view, and we would hypothesize that at least part of this resistance is the result of the program structure of educational television programs. During the course of our work, we have not found previous studies which relate directly to the question of the program structure of ETV and resistance to that form of broadcasting.

1. Starlin, D.G., Application to the Commissioner of Education, U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for a grant to support a research project under provisions of Title VII of the National Defense Act of 1958. (Dittoed, January 26, 1960)

Each of the proposals which follows is rooted in a preceding series of intensive field studies: During the course of our work to date, we have completed two intensive interview surveys of individuals who were potential viewers of KOAC-TV, the educational channel available to cable users in Eugene, Oregon.¹ These interviews have provided much understanding of the attitudes, opinions, and behavior of the people who are using (or not using) the services of the station. It is from these data that we have generated the hypotheses underlying the various designs proposed in this report. These proposals are not, therefore, merely speculative thinking on our part; they are real questions which have become important as the result of the expressions of real people in real situations. We would hope that broadcasters might look to the results obtained from these designs with more confidence than is sometimes the case, since they know that these problems and designs have their origin in actual audience response.

Each of the proposals which follows is conceived of as part of a series of correlated and integrated studies, not simply a discrete research suggestion: As we have developed this report, it has become increasingly clear that there must be an integral relationship between each of the designs proposed. If we are to go beyond the commonplace, the mere listing of possible research

1. M.N. Goldstein, W.T. Martin, and J.R. Shepherd, Educational Television Project: Preliminary Report Number One, The University of Oregon, no date. (Multilithed; 43 pp.)

areas, then it seems imperative to us that we show an integrated and disciplined series of concrete proposals. We have found that it is virtually impossible for us to consider this problem without thinking of it in terms of a kind of sequential relationship.

We cannot, for example, think of the whole problem of audience reaction to program structure without first having some idea of what program structure is. The threads of all of our proposals are interwoven in this way.

Some Empirical Data:

It could be argued that the relationship between program structure and resistance to educational television constitutes an area which requires investigation simply because of the relative dearth of information about those relationships. One could undertake such research with more enthusiasm, however, if some evidence were available indicating that program structure may make a difference in educational television viewing. We have sought, therefore, some empirical warrant before embarking upon the detailed planning of the proposed research designs.

We turned to the data gathered thus far in the Project to determine whether or not any evidence exists indicating that program structure is related to resistance to educational television. More specifically, we wanted to know if viewers make judgments of program structure along some dimensions on which there is an implicit consensus. Do they exercise a critical function here as opposed to offhand utterances of a generalized attitude? Then, if such a critical judgment is made, might it be related to resistance to educational television?

An Index of Evaluation was calculated for each subject in the major study by using three items from the semantic differential scale; Good-Bad, I Like-I Dislike, Interesting-Dull. The distribution of subjects on the seven-step index was as follows:

Low Evaluation							High Evaluation	Total
0	1	2	3	4	5	6		
295	89	141	115	156	80	148		N=1,024
29%	9%	14%	11%	15%	8%	15%		

The broad distribution of judgments seen here likely indicates that the subjects did make differing evaluations of KOAC-TV. Though the bases of these judgments are not known, the fact that the judgments are not preponderantly in the neutral category (3) supports our inference.

The next question is, are these evaluations related directly to educational television viewing? The matrix below, relating the seven-step Index of Evaluation to a six-step Index of Educational Television Utilization, offers some answers to this question.

KOAC-TV Evaluation	KOAC-TV Utilization			
	High 1, 2	Medium 3, 4	Low 5, 6	Total
High 4, 5, 6	155	168	120	443
Neutral 3	10	182	314	506
Low 0, 1, 2	0	15	60	75
Total	165	365	494	1,024

One can see the relationship from the matrix (contingency coefficient = .447, $p < .01$). It would appear that the two variables are positively associated. The only deviation from this interpretation is the existence of the group which gives KOAC-TV a higher evaluation but which seldom watches. Other studies from the Oregon Project, not yet published, present explanations for this event. It appears that many who are favorable to KOAC-TV do not view because of conflicts in the viewing setting, e.g., a large family with many other competing interests. It is supposed that these persons would view educational television if they were the sole determiners of the program choice. With this behavior explained, the inference of a relationship between evaluation and utilization of educational television seems reasonable.

As another approach to answering some of our initial questions, we turned to the interview data from the field study and compared groups whose educational television viewing habits differed greatly. Those

items from the interview schedule, questionnaire, and semantic differential which appeared to be related to program structure, either directly or indirectly, were selected for analysis.

Two groups of subjects were chosen from the total population for this analysis. One group (n=156) was composed of those persons who were categorized as educational television enthusiasts in the project. These are persons whose viewing of ETV was relatively great and whose evaluation of educational television was high. The other group (n=50) was composed from those subjects labeled resisters and uncertain abstainers in the project. These were persons who seldom viewed educational television and whose evaluation of educational television was low. Those subjects who reported they never watch KOAC-TV, they can't get KOAC-TV, and/or they haven't heard of KOAC-TV were eliminated. The reason for this selection was our concern for getting at the evaluative function. We reasoned that if one disparages educational television but never watches it, his evaluation is more likely to represent a generalized attitude than a critical judgment. We were interested in those who knew what educational television was and who had seen it but who resisted viewing KOAC-TV.

The following are the comparisons between the two groups on the items analyzed from the semantic differential.

	VIEWERS (n=156)			RESISTERS (n=50)		
	Like	Neutral	Dislike	Like	Neutral	Dislike
TV	92%	5%	3%	98%	2%	0%
KOAC	97%	3%	0%	5%	52%	42%
	Interesting Neutral		Dull	Interesting Neutral		Dull
TV	92%	7%	1%	96%	0%	4%
KOAC	96%	1%	3%	0%	38%	62%
	Amateur	Neutral	Professional	Amateur	Neutral	Professional
TV	32%	24%	44%	42%	26%	32%
KOAC	39%	11%	50%	20%	56%	24%

One item was taken from the questionnaire.

"Most educational television programs are boring."

VIEWERS	RESISTERS	
	Agree	Disagree
Agree	28%	72%
Disagree	52%	48%

A number of differences in judgment can be seen from these data. In the like-dislike and interesting-dull items the two groups cannot be compared directly on their evaluation of KOAC since these items were used in part to select the extreme groups. What is important here is the manner in which they differentially judge general television and educational KOAC-TV. The educational television viewers judge both television and KOAC-TV as liked and as interesting. While most resisters dislike KOAC-TV and consider it dull, their evaluations of general television are extremely similar to those of the viewers. A difference in judging can also be seen on the amateur-professional

item. While the viewers tend to judge it as one or the other, the majority of the resisters tend to be non-committal and use the middle category. The difference between viewers and resisters on the questionnaire item is apparent. One noteworthy point is that the resisters do not condemn KOAC-TV uniformly and categorically. We take this to be a further indication of the function of judgment and not the expression of generalized attitudes.

These empirical data, then, do present some indications that people make evaluations of educational television which can be related to their viewing behavior. Whether these evaluations are critical judgments of program structure and not merely expressions of generalized attitudes cannot be fully assessed from the materials now available to us. We have some support for this inference, however, and while the margin of our mandate is not as great as we might prefer, we feel more confident in suggesting the following projects as worthy research endeavors.

Summary of Objectives:

Our overall objective in this report is to articulate research designs calculated to explore the relationships which may exist between educational television program structure and educational television resistance. Our primary focus is on stimulus variables rather than on organismic variables. We feel there are a number of related questions which must be answered in the process of testing the hypotheses underlying our work, and that these are sequential in nature. Our intent is to develop the designs necessary to achieve some understanding of the problem with which we are concerned. We hope our report will serve as the guide for these studies in the future.

Part II

THE PRODUCER AND ETV PROGRAM STRUCTURE

We begin our proposals with a question which is fundamental to our thinking: What is educational television program structure? The proposals put forth in this section of the report are aimed primarily at defining and attempting to understand the stimulus variables rather than dealing with variables of audience response. The interaction between these variables may also be of importance. At this point, however, our first concern is in what takes place at the point of origination of the broadcast signal, and not what occurs at the point of reception. In terms of the communications pattern, attention is centered on what happens before the signal is fed into the camera. Anything which bears upon how the signal is decided upon, changed, or presented is the proper sphere of our interest in exploring the research potentials of educational television program structure.

Each of the studies proposed in this report follows the same method of presentation and an explanation of procedure here may be of value. Heading each of the proposals is the major question underlying the design. These are lettered consecutively and numbered according to the particular section of the report in which they occur for ease in reference. We then present a rationale for the study suggested and outline the proposed procedures in detail.

As stated before, we conceive of these designs as occurring in sequence. It is quite obvious that if one were to carry out these designs, new hypotheses and avenues for research would appear. We do

not hold that our direction is the only one possible or that it is necessarily the best. It is merely the direction we feel compelled to follow on the basis of our previous work in the Oregon Educational Television Project.

II A. What are the elements of ETV program structure?

Much research effort has been directed to the attempt to describe certain elements of educational television program structure. This research has been primarily of a descriptive nature, and content analysis (loosely defined) appears to have been the principle research method.

It might be valuable to list here in brief form some of the categorizing systems which have been employed. Schramm¹ summarizes research in which the elements below have been analyzed. The areas and the categories covered are listed.

1. The station's broadcasting hours

- a. hours/day
- b. hours/week

2. Source of programs

- a. NET
- b. local and other non-NET sources

3. Intended audience

- a. in-school or credit-course use
- b. chiefly children's viewing (out of school)
- c. chiefly adult viewing (but not for course credit)

1. W. Schramm, "The Content of Educational Television," in Schramm, editor, The Impact of Educational Television, op. cit.

4. Program form

Table I

	a. discussion	
	b. talks	
	c. lecture-drama	
	d. documentary	
	e. drama	
1. Informa	f. music	.03
2. In	5. Kind of program content	.03
3. Educati	a. entertainment	.07
	b. religion	.59
4. Informa	c. agriculture	.05
	d. news	.20
5. Religi	e. children	.01
	f. sports	
6. Childre	g. teaching and other information	.01
7. Ar	6. Content by disciplines	.04
8. Variety	a. social science	.13
	b. humanities	
9. Drama	c. natural science	.24
	d. fine arts	
10. Drama	e. utility	.08

Schramm's summary also includes a comparison between educational television and commercial television on varying amounts of program time devoted by community stations, university stations, school stations, and network stations to (1) entertainment and (2) teaching and information.

In the University of Oregon Television Project, the program structure of KOAC-TV has been categorized according to (1) program form and (2) program kind.¹ The broadcast time of KOAC-TV has also been analyzed according to fourteen program types and then compared with a similar analysis for the four commercial stations available on the cable service in Eugene. Table I contains the data from the comparison.

1. J.R. Shepherd, "A Study of Some Aspects of KOAC-TV Programming and its Audience," Educational Television Project: Preliminary Report Number Two, The University of Oregon, May 3, 1961. (Mimeographed, 37 pp.)

Table I

Comparison of KOAC-TV and Commercial Station Programming

Program Types	Proportion of commercial Programming, 117 hrs./wk.	Proportion of KOAC-TV Programming, 34 hrs./wk.
1. Information-news	.03	
2. Information-discussion	.03	.08
3. Educational programs	.07	.59
4. Information-informal	.05	.20
5. Religious programs	.01	
6. Children's shows	.07	.03
7. Artistic entertainment	.04	.09
8. Variety, popular music, etc.	.13	
9. Drama-adventure	.14	
10. Drama-comedy	.09	
11. Drama-miscellaneous	.09	
12. Quiz shows	.08	
13. Sports	.06	.02
14. Movies	.10	
	<u>.99</u>	<u>1.01</u>

From this review, one can see that program structure has been investigated from a number of approaches. The listing of categories employed in these analyses is fairly lengthy. Time units of various lengths have served usually as the unit of measurement. Although in most cases the categories are quite general, these studies have done much to set forth an understanding of the subject matter on educational television.

One aspect of program structure seems generally to have been neglected in these studies. This is the area of television production. While a very general content analysis of production factors can be found, e.g., program form, and while many production techniques have been incorporated into experimental designs in which they have served as independent variables and have been related to recall of program subject matter, a specific content analysis of production techniques is not available. A content analysis of production techniques in educational television would complement similar approaches to educational television subject matter, and would provide us with a more complete understanding of educational television program structure. Educational television should be described in this manner and then compared with commercial television. It would seem that an analysis of this type might well precede any experimenting with production variables. It may well give insights as to which production variables should be incorporated into the experimental designs.

Production variables are especially important for yet another reason. In most cases, production variables could be altered without great difficulty. On the other hand, if one changed the subject matter of educational television markedly, he would be changing the very nature of and the the definition of educational television. Hence, the proposed project: a content analysis of production variables in educational television.

Procedure: This study would involve (1) an analysis of educational television according to categories of production variables, and (2) a comparison of these results with a similar analysis of commercial television.

The major problems in this proposal have to do with (1) the selection of categories, (2) the selection of units of measurement, (3) the sampling of a station's programming for analysis, and (4) the reliability of the categorizing.

It is obvious that the selection of categories and units of measurement is the major task in the project. As Bernard Berelson has stated, "Content analysis stands or falls by its categories." The writers have labored over this problem and have arrived at a system of categories and units of measurement which are presented in Table II. It is not supposed that we have covered every conceivable production variable and it has not been our intention to meet the needs of all researchers who are interested in program structure. It is hoped, however, that with appropriate modifications, this system may have a broader use than merely for the particular study we propose. We have been guided in this selection by the desire to be adequately encompassing and complete in our analysis. Our efforts have been checked, however, by our awareness of the practical limitations a researcher would face in such a project.

Table II

Categories and Units for Analysis
of Production Factors in ETV Program Structure

Categories

Units of Analysis

Cameras

1. Number

[Number used during program

2. Lenses

a. Wide angle

[a. Number of shots with each

b. Telephoto

b. Total time with each

c. Normal

3. Angles

- a. 0 degrees
- b. 45 degrees
- c. 90 degrees

- a. Number of shots at each
- b. Total time at each

4. Positions

- a. Short shot
- b. Medium shot
- c. Long shot

- a. Number of shots at each
- b. Total time at each

5. Movement

- a. Dolly
- b. Truck
- c. Pan

- Number of each during program

6. Transitions

- a. Cut
- b. Dissolve
- c. Fade
- d. Superimposition

- Number of each during program

Lighting

- 1. High key
- 2. Low key
- 3. Key light
- 4. Fill light
- 5. Back light
- 6. Set light

- Total time at each

Background

- 1. Indoors
- 2. Outdoors
- 3. Representational
- 4. Stylized

- Total time with each

Graphic devices

- 1. Film clips
- 2. Slides
- 3. Studio cards-charts-maps
- 4. Photographs
- 5. Blackboards
- 6. Objects
- 7. Rear projection screen
- 8. Animation

- a. Number of each during program
- b. Total time with each

Audio

- | | |
|--------------------------|---|
| 1. Number of microphones | Number used during program |
| 2. Music | |
| a. Introduction | [Total time at each |
| b. Transitions | |
| c. Background | |
| 3. Speaking | |
| | a. Total time during program |
| | b. Words/minute during speaking periods |

Participants

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 1. Total number | Total number during program |
| 2. Number on camers | [a. Number of shots with one person, ...
two persons, three... etc.
b. Total time at each interval |
| 3. Sex | [a. Number of each in program
b. Total time for (1) men alone,
(2) women alone, and (3) combined |
| 4. Age | Rating according to (1) juvenile,
(2) adolescent, (3) young adult,
(4) adult, and (5) aged |
| 5. Physical attractiveness | Rating according to (1) attractive,
(2) average, and (3) unattractive |
| 6. Dress | |
| a. Conventional clothing | [Total time with each |
| b. Costume | |
| 7. Interaction--verbal exchange | Rating according to (1) much, (2) average, and (3) little |
| 8. Activity--movement in set | Rating according to (1) much,
(2) average, and (3) little |

Format

- | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1. Lecture | [Check which format typifies program |
| 2. Lecture-demonstration | |
| 3. Interview | |
| 4. Discussion | |
| 5. Drama | |
| 6. Documentary | |
| 7. Music | |

Introductions

1. Title--straight
2. Title--superimposed
3. Title--animated
4. Hook-action preceding title

[Check which format typifies the program

Humor

1. Verbal
2. Visual

[Total time devoted to each

In order to achieve a satisfactory degree of reliability of categorizing it would be well to choose three or four persons well-versed in television production to serve as judges. One could then have these persons approach a consensus on the standards of judgment by means of discussion, comparative evaluations, and pilot analyses. In most cases, it would appear that the units of measurement are reasonably objective.

The sampling of programs for analysis is another major task in this proposed project. It is made difficult because of the wide variety of program types which defies combining and by the great differences between programming in educational television and commercial TV. Following a consideration of a number of possible approaches to this question, we would suggest an independent analysis of a "typical" program for each of the fourteen program types for educational television and commercial TV. It would seem undesirable to us to attempt any "averaging" over program types. If this procedure were followed, it would provide a reasonably complete profile of the production factors in the program structure of educational television and would also provide the data for comparison with commercial TV.

These considerations, then, have covered the rationale, materials, and procedures for this proposed research design.

Summary: There has been much research effort describing certain elements of educational television program structure. Broadcasting hours, sources of programs, intended audiences, program forms, kinds of program content and content by disciplines have been the dimensions of analyses employed by various researchers. A content analysis of production techniques is one aspect of program structure which would appear to have been neglected.

As basic to subsequent designs in this report, we propose in this first suggestion a design involving the use of content analysis in an assessment of typical educational television program structure. Inherent in this idea is a similar treatment of selected programs and a comparison of the data obtained from both sources. In Table II we have listed the suggested categories and units to be used.

I. H. Kusata, "Perceptions of the Role of Educational Television by
 KTV Station Personnel and Community Leaders," Unpublished monograph,
 Communications Research Center, Michigan State University.

II B. Who are the program originators in educational television?

In Study II A, we considered what educational program structure is. In this section we address ourselves to the question of how this structure came to be and we focus our attention on some of the individuals who make decisions regarding program structure. Because of our prevailing interest in questions about program structure, we are interested in understanding the motivations, attitudes, and expectations of those most involved with and responsible for the program function. We believe that the individuals most critically involved with this process would be those who hold the position of program director, producer, or director.

We are not the first to raise the question of how the educational television broadcaster views himself. Kumata, in his study, "Perceptions of the Role of Educational Television by ETV Station Personnel and Community Leaders," investigated questions regarding general programming objectives of "key" ETV personnel.¹ Among the findings of this study were the fact that 82 per cent of the station personnel thought that educational television could lure the general audience away from commercial television with some kinds of programs, while only 67 per cent of the community leaders thought that this could happen. Also noted is the finding that while only 9 per cent of the station personnel list the apathy of the public as the biggest barrier to educational television progress, 38 per cent of the community

1. H. Kumata, "Perceptions of the Role of Educational Television by ETV Station Personnel and Community Leaders," Unpublished monograph, Communications Research Center, Michigan State University.

Predicting Audience Reaction to a Television Program, a paper presented at Mid-West Sociological Society Meeting, Minneapolis, Minnesota, April 26, 1958.

leaders thought this was a serious problem. These typical findings seem to clearly indicate that there is a difference between what educational television station personnel and what the public believe. This generalization seems supported by another study by Cleary and Beal entitled "TV Producer's Competence in Predicting Audience Reactions to a Television Program."¹ This exploratory study was based on the notion that if a television producer is to achieve the desired objectives, he must be able to predict how the audience will respond to his message. On a group of 24 items, it was found that the "public affairs TV producers" of Station WOI-TV could predict accurately on 74 per cent of them.

While there seems to be some contradiction between the findings of these two studies, both function to shed some light on the general problem which concerns us here. These studies, as well as our own reflections on the possible relationship of program structure to resistance causes us to ask the basic and underlying question of the study: What are the attitudes, motivations, and expectations of educational television program originators which may relate to program structure? A secondary question we pose, growing from the first and dependent upon it, is: If these relationships do exist, how might they contribute to audience resistance?

We have previously suggested a study to get a better understanding of what the educational television program is. But the program is the product of a person, and we would wish now to look at that individual.

1. N.V. Cleary and G.M. Beal, "Television Producers' Competence in Predicting Audience Reaction to a Television Program," a paper presented at Mid-West Sociological Society Meeting, Minneapolis, Minnesota, April 26, 1958.

While we would agree that it is of value to know something of the "key personnel" of the station, such as Kumata studied, and that this group may include those involved in program decisions, we feel the most fruitful area would be to conduct intensive investigations of the individuals who are directly responsible for what the public sees. The more directly we concentrate on producers and directors, the more certain we feel we might be of establishing some causal relationship between attitudes, beliefs, and products. In principle, we seek in this design to get at the dynamics of the decisions involved in getting programs on the air.

Procedure: In this study we propose a mailed questionnaire to a representative sample of educational television program originators. We would select the subjects by sending a packet of questionnaires to each station manager, requesting that he distribute these to those individuals within the station who would qualify under the definitions presented. That is, each individual in the station who produces, directs, or fulfills a combination of these tasks would be requested to complete the form and return it directly to the researcher. There would be no need for personal identification on the questionnaires--a consecutive numbering system would provide a method of checking how many had been returned from which stations. The distribution of responses from the various types of stations would be important, of course, and one could anticipate the need for considerable effort in stimulating responses from the less cooperative. We are aware of the possible limitations of the mailed questionnaire as a source of information

on some of the items in which we are interested. Measures of attitudes present, for example, many difficult problems. We would hope that the semantic differentials proposed would elicit these data. It is appropriate to note here that in Study II C, which follows, we suggest a further step which amplifies the present proposal.

In this study, it would be our intent to question the respondent along five general avenues. Within each of these areas there would be included particular inquiries along the lines indicated below. The outline following constitutes the frame around which we built the instruments, which are included in Appendix A.

Table III

Major Lines of Inquiry to Determine
Attributes of ETV Program Originators

I. Identifying the ETV program originator:

A. Responsibilities:

Number and type of program for which responsible

B. Training and experience:

Professional training and experience

C. Background information:

Age; Marital status; Children; Salary; Education; Political party affiliation; Church membership; Professional and lay organization membership, Offices held, Reading habits.

II. Objectives of the ETV program originator:

Rank ordering of avowed objectives for educational television

III. Attitudes of the ETV program originator:

A. Toward self

1. His estimation of importance
2. His estimation of his capability
3. His estimation of station authority structure and his place in it.

B. Toward co-workers

1. His estimation of co-operativeness of others
2. His estimation of their estimation of his worth
3. His estimation of their capabilities

C. Toward Job:

1. Estimation of worthwhileness of work
2. Estimation of how influential in community
3. Estimation of personal satisfaction in the job
4. Estimation of job aspirations

D. Toward educational television:

1. How does he evaluate the status of ETV now?
2. What does he feel the future for ETV will be?

E. Toward audience

1. His estimation of what the "typical" educational television audience is:
 - a. Audience age; Education; Salary; Sex; ETV use; Marital status; Family size; Occupation; Socio-economic level
 - b. Estimation of cultural level of programs in terms of cultural level of audience
 - c. Evaluation of value of audience comments on and criticisms of educational television

IV. Audience and research information available to ETV program originator:

A. Source of information:

1. Number of solicited, unsolicited mail
2. Number of solicited, unsolicited telephone calls
3. Number of visits
4. Number of studies, surveys known to have been conducted by station or agencies for station

B. Use made of audience information

V. Implementation of ideas and decisions by ETV program originator:

What are the factors which block ideas and decisions?

Summary: In this section of the report we have presented a design intended to get at one of the important links in the communicative chain within the structure of educational television. We have centered our attention on the attempt to describe the key attributes and characteristics of those individuals who are responsible for the product received from the station by the viewers. In addition to a rationale for the point of view that these individuals are crucial to the programming and therefore crucial to understanding resistance to educational television, we have listed the directions this investigation might take by noting five major lines of inquiry. We have developed the instruments which would appear on a priori inspection to be capable of getting at the dimensions of motivations, attitudes, and expectations of educational television program originators. Sophisticated readers need not be warned that the proposed instruments should certainly be field tested in a pilot study before they are used for any large scale investigation. Finally, in this section, we have presented the rationale for what we will propose as a third study relating to the total problem we have undertaken as Part II of this report.

II C. What are the dynamics of the decision-making process in the development of program structure?

In the preceding proposal, we outlined an approach to the problem of describing the educational broadcaster. What we wish to propose here essentially is an extension and development of the data we would hope to uncover in the execution of study II B.

The inherent limitation we see in our previous proposal is that while it provides us with important information about individuals and their attitudes, it tells us relatively little how these individuals are working and interacting together. This, as we see it, is not a failing in the previously proposed design, but rather one of the limitations of the questionnaire method. With the present proposal, we feel it is possible to complete the picture of that which had been sketched before, and thus to assess directly how the program originator may be influenced by those with whom he is in contact.

Procedure: Using the data uncovered by the survey in study II B as a model and source of direction for further inquiry, we propose a series of case studies involving intensive and relatively prolonged observations and interviews of program originators in selected educational and commercial television stations. The selection of cases would consider the following characteristics:

1. University and community television stations.
2. Urban and rural commercial television stations.
3. Network program sources.

We propose that these individuals be studied along two major lines, again bearing in mind that these avenues might be modified by previous findings of the previous survey. It would be expected that much of the interview schedule to be used in this study would be drawn from the questionnaire, and therefore it would seem inappropriate to attempt to specify here in detail what should be included in the schedule. This does not preclude, however, the necessity of making clear the dimensions on which the interview might proceed. We propose the major directions outlined below.

Line one: Attitude toward self may be crucial to the functioning of an individual as a program originator. Basing our question on materials drawn from the data obtained on the semantic differentials used in the prior study, we would probe into these three areas:

1. What are the objectives/goals he sees for that for which he is responsible?
2. What are the limitations and blocks he sees in terms of achieving the objectives he seeks?
3. What does he see as the decision making structure of the station?
 - a. His place in it
 - b. The "boss" structure and his place in that structure.

Line two: Growing from the first line of investigation, we would anticipate becoming involved in questions of what the communication network within the station or place of program origination might be. Presuming that feedback would be of import in modifying program structure, it would be necessary to probe the following areas:

1. What messages does he actually get?

- a. From co-workers
- b. From superiors (bosses)
- c. From audiences

2. What messages from the above sources does he accept?

- a. His evaluation of the relative "worth" of these messages

3. What does he do with the messages accepted?

- a. How are these utilized, if used at all, in modification of the program structure.

Summary: The proposal outlines in this section of our report should develop from the inquiry conducted under the proposal of Part II B. This design gets at the need for an intensive interview/observational study of the program originating personnel in order to determine two major aspects of their attitudes. These are: First, beliefs regarding objectives and goals, and secondly, views of their positions in the communicative and decision-making structure of the station.

Part III

THE AUDIENCE AND ETV PROGRAM STRUCTURE

In the proposals presented in Part II, we were concerned with stimulus variables, and we investigated the input of the television system. In this section of the report, it is our intention to pose a series of studies designed to get at the response variables. These studies investigate the output of the television system. In the first, instance, we advocated an analysis of the relationship of the program originator to program structure. We turn now to an analysis of the relationship of the viewer to program structure.

In Part III we are interested in discovering how people respond to individual ETV programs and to the production techniques of those programs. All of the designs presented here have as an experimental constant a "Program X." We hope to find out whether resistance to educational television might in part be a product of the production techniques of a program or group of programs to which the individual has been exposed. Unlike our previous field studies, the subjects' attitudes toward a generalized concept of ETV are of relatively little interest; we are concerned now with detailed reactions to specific programs.

A review of related research makes apparent the fact that more studies have been conducted on audience response to ETV program structure than on the development of that program structure itself, the area covered in Part II of this report. A good many studies are available which probe the effectiveness of television as a teaching tool. One can

also find many studies which relate specific production techniques such as camera angle, "reduced" script, and rate of development to retention of subject matter. A few studies relate these variables also to attitudes and attitude change. In short, the body of research on television audience reaction is sizable.

In terms of our particular interests, there are data which give some general ideas of the viewers' perceptions of the ETV image and their judgments of that image. Stanley, MacLean, Jr., and Carter¹ comment that the perception by many viewers is that the educational television station is merely the formal schooling process transplanted to the television screen. They see the subjects as dull, the format as school, and the audience as students. Kumata,² in addition to the findings previously noted, found educational television station personnel and community leaders to be in agreement that the main criticisms leveled against ETV are those of dull programs, too-specialized subject matter, and poor technical production. Westley³ studies widespread beliefs concerning the image of ETV and found that ETV is thought of as (1) something for the Universities, schools, and for children, (2) anything factual on television, and (3) "clean" television. He found that commercial

1. R. Stanley, M. MacLean, and R. Carter, "Exploring Problem Areas in Educational Television: Attitudes and Perceptions," Research Bulletin Number 5, University of Wisconsin Television Laboratory, Madison, Wisconsin, June 1, 1956.

2. H. Kumata, op. cit.

3. B. Westley, "Attitudes Toward Educational Television," Research Bulletin Number 10, University of Wisconsin Television Laboratory, Madison, Wisconsin, July 31, 1958.

television is rationalized as educational because it "teaches history" via westerns and "teaches a lesson" via family dramas. MacLean, Jr., Crane and Kier¹ have made a careful study of the general dimensions of viewer judgment of ETV. Beginning with numerous judgments of (1) subject matter, (2) performer, and (3) production quality, these researchers found four factors or basic dimensions of audience judgment. These were (1) Presentation evaluation, (2) Activity, (3) Subject evaluation and utility, and (4) Clarity.

Our interest in this aspect of the total problem can be expressed in the question: What are the criterial elements by means of which viewers perceive and evaluate educational television program structure? We submit that an understanding of the kind and nature of these evaluations, divorced as much as possible from generalized attitudes, would be a direct and practicable route toward reducing resistances to educational television.

III A. Do ETV fans and resisters make differing evaluations of ETV program structure?

Early in this report some empirical data were noted as a warrant for the development of the remainder of the report. We wish to prepose here an extension of that analysis, making use of different instruments and additional interviews in order to more directly get at possible relationships between judgments and evaluations of program structure and resistances to educational television.

1. M. MacLean, Jr., et. al., op. cit.

On the strength of our prior work, and on the basis of rather extensive literature in the area of television and audience response, we are confident that one can say that viewers do make judgments of television. Our aim here is intended to get at what is to us the more important question, how do these judgments relate to resistance.

Just as an understanding of the elements of educational television program structure (Study II A) was crucial to and a foundation for the other studies we proposed in Part II, we see this design as a cornerstone for the others to follow in this section. Until we have tested more fully the hypothesis that program structure judgments are related to resistance, we are on uncertain ground in proposing additional studies testing variables in connection with program structure. The problem is to move beyond the present limits of the previous field surveys, and to get at the question of the effects of program structure on the audience more directly.

Procedure: In Part I of this report, the procedures were outlined for a preliminary investigation of the relationships between educational television viewing practices and ETV program structure. In that study, the evaluations of educational television program structure by a group of fans and by a group of resisters were compared. The major difficulty there was that the items measuring evaluations of program structure were taken from the original data of the Oregon Television Project. These items were not constructed with program structure in mind, and the few relevant items chosen for examination were indirect indicators at most.

The study proposed here would follow the same general procedures as outlined in the preliminary study mentioned but would incorporate more refined measurement items in the questionnaire. It is suggested that the work of MacLean, Crane, and Kiel¹ on the dimensions with which viewers rate educational television programs would be especially appropriate for this purpose. The dimensions are as follows:

1. Presentation Evaluation: Including the general evaluation of the production and of the performer.
2. Activity: Tapping the activity level of the performance generally and also the activity level of the performer.
3. Subject Evaluation and Utility: Simply an evaluation of the subject matter and a judgment of its utility to the viewer.
4. Clarity: Involving simplicity in production and understandability of subject matter.

Again based on the prior work of these researchers, the primary device suggested for the collection of the necessary data would be the semantic differential, administered in personal interviews in the home. If this were to be done outside of the Eugene, Oregon, area it would be necessary to develop additional instruments to define educational television producers and fans.

In regard to the content of the instrument to be used in the interviews, it would seem expeditious to make use of those semantic differential scales developed by Mac Lean, Jr., et. al., as the major source of the data. The scales recommended can be found in Appendix B.

1. M. MacLean., Jr. et. al., op. cit.

Summary: In essence, what is proposed here is an extension of the study reported in Part I. The problem in this design is to relate judgments of program structure to resistance to educational television. We hope to get at this directly by administering semantic differential scales to a group of educational television fans and a group of resisters and then compare their responses.

III B. How aware of television program structure are television viewers?

Study III A suggests the use of a scale to get general evaluations by fans and resisters of educational television program structure. The present proposal would become more specific. It asks, what does the viewer see? How much of what appears on the television screen is he aware of? This information would permit us to compare fans' and resisters' actual perceptions of television production techniques. It would penetrate deeper into the relationship between resistance to educational television viewing and educational television program structure. It would hope to uncover specific factors in educational television production which are criterial aspects in audience perception and which relate to the tendencies to resist educational television viewing.

Procedure: A first step in the procedure of this proposal would require the selection of "typical" programs from educational television and commercial television. The programs could be selected from those employed in Study II A. At any rate, the program should have been subjected to a content analysis according to the categories of II A prior to its broadcast, or it should be kinescoped for such an analysis following its broadcast.

Some time before the program is to be aired, contact must be made with those persons selected to serve as subjects and their cooperation must be obtained. It is suggested that at the time of broadcast an interviewer should go to the home of the subject in order to provide better research control during the viewing session. The interviewer could explain the project briefly and could sit with the family during the performance. Following the program, he could administer the questionnaire included in Appendix C to all the members of the family who viewed the program. The interviewer could answer questions which might arise and explain some of the items in the questionnaire. He could also submit a report describing his observations of the viewing situation and the degree of cooperation attained.

With these data, a comparison could be made of audience response to the questionnaire and the content analysis of the program by television experts. Perceptions of fans and resisters could be compared.

Summary: This proposal asks subjects to attempt a content analysis of television production techniques. Their efforts would be compared with a similar but more objective content analysis by television authorities. This would inform us of what aspects of television program structure the viewer is most aware.

III C. How specific are viewers' perceptions of television program structure?

Just as III B was more specific proposal than was III A, we suggest III C now as a further refinement in this series. Proposal III B was concerned with the viewers' general awareness of program

structure after viewing a complete program. That study would be exploratory and would have the virtue of attacking the problem of audience perception in a natural setting.

Proposal III B has a limitation in the fact that since the questionnaire is completed following the viewing of an entire program, one must rely heavily on the memory of the subject and on his ability to separate, after the fact, all the elements of program structure to which he has been exposed during the previous quarter-hour or half-hour. To complement III B we propose a further study which would investigate the ability of viewers to perceive differences between pairs of specifically contrasted and controlled elements of program structure, when presented with these pairs in a laboratory setting. This study would involve a setting less natural than III B but would have the advantage of obtaining the subject's judgment immediately following his observation of controlled stimuli.

Procedure: For this study it would be necessary to bring the subjects to the studio. In small groups, composed of from six to ten persons each, they would view a kinescope prepared by the examiners. The kinescope would contain a series of paired sequences of short duration. In each pair of stimuli, all factors would be held constant except for one production technique which would be varied. It is suggested that each pair be reversed and shown again during the viewing session. This procedure will serve as a reliability check and would also help to prevent ordinal position from confounding the results. Following the viewing of each pair, the subjects would complete

the items listed for that pair on the questionnaire. It could then be determined whether or not the subjects had perceived the production technique which had been varied. Once again, the perceptions of fans and resisters could be compared.

A listing of suggested paired sequences for testing is included as Appendix D. A sample item form for the questionnaire appears as Appendix E.

Summary: This study would be a further investigation of audience perception of television program structure. It questions whether the viewer can perceive differences in production techniques when all other factors are controlled in a laboratory setting and when his judgment is called for immediately following his viewing of the experimental conditions.

The purpose of this study is to determine whether the viewer can perceive differences in production techniques when all other factors are controlled in a laboratory setting and when his judgment is called for immediately following his viewing of the experimental conditions. The study is designed to test the hypothesis that the viewer can perceive differences in production techniques when all other factors are controlled in a laboratory setting and when his judgment is called for immediately following his viewing of the experimental conditions.

1. The producer (and his situation) in the situation;

2. The viewer (and his perception) of educational television program structure.

SUMMARY

This report outlines a series of six research proposals intended to assess the relationship of television program structure (as defined in Part I) to resistance to educational television.

These proposals have their origins in the prior field work done at the University of Oregon as part of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare sponsored studies of Resistance to Educational Television. In this report, the suggested designs differ from what has gone before and would appear to offer some directions for research which would be profitable avenues to follow. They stress the question of the relationships of educational television viewing resistance to program structure in particular; they place importance on the relationship of laboratory studies to the preceding field studies, and they are mutually integrated. In previous work by the Oregon research group, stress was placed upon organismic and response variables; in this case, attention is focused on stimulus and response variables.

A warrant to undertake the present report was found in empirical data collected in the original surveys. These data, presented in Part I of the present report, indicate that people make evaluations of educational television which can be related to viewing behavior. With this somewhat tentative mandate, we felt justified in turning our attention to the two major frames of reference within which we might expect to develop significant designs. These were.

1. The producer (and his situation) in the station;
2. The viewer (and his perception) of educational television program structure.

It seemed obvious that if we were to determine the influence of program structure upon the viewers, it would be necessary first to determine the nature of program structure. We formulated three designs calculated to get at this question.

Study II A. "What are the elements of ETV program structure?"

It was proposed here that a content analysis of the program structure of educational television be made, and that these data be compared with those obtained from a similar analysis of commercial television. Table II, pages 19 to 22 presents the suggested categories and units of measurement for the proposed analysis.

Study II B. "Who are the program originators in ETV?"

We recommended here the dual question of how program structure comes into being, and who are the individuals who make decisions regarding program structure. By means of a mail questionnaire, a tentative form of which is included in Appendix A, we would hope to identify the ETV producer, get at his attitudes and objectives, and describe the communicative structure in which he functions.

Study II C. "What are the dynamics of the decision-making process in the development of ETV program structure?"

By means of the case study method, we propose here an intensive study of "program originators" (producers and directors) in selected ETV and commercial stations. We see the following as the major lines of inquiry for the relatively unstructured interviews:

first, analysis of the program originators' attitudes toward self and possible implications in terms of program structure; secondly, analysis of the functioning of the communicative structure in which that individual finds himself.

The designs summarized thus far relate to the first frame of reference (the producer) and are concerned with what we call stimulus variables. Those from the second frame of reference (the audience) deal primarily with the response variables. Three designs have evolved which seem appropriate to our interests.

Study III A: "Do ETV fans and resisters make differing evaluations of ETV program structure?"

Utilizing as the major tool of inquiry a semantic differential administered as part of personal interviews of fans and resisters in the home, we would expect to tap four major areas of program structure evaluation: (1) Presentation evaluation, (2) Activity, (3) Subject evaluation and utility, and (4) Clarity. The semantic differentials which would seem appropriate for this objective are included in Appendix B.

Study III B. "How aware of television program structure are viewers?"

Based upon the content analysis proposed in Study II A, an instrument called the Viewer's Program Check List was prepared and is included in Appendix C. In this design, it is proposed that the Check List be administered in the home to a selected group of resisters and fans. These subjects would be requested to complete their check lists with reference to a previously content analyzed

commercial and/or educational television program. The differences between what is actually presented (as determined from the prior content analysis) and what is seen (as determined by the Viewer's Program Check List) could be determined. The reactions of fans and resisters could then be compared.

Study III C: "How specific are viewers' perceptions of television program structure?"

In the previous study a method was proposed to assess audience reaction to a total program in the home setting. In the present proposal, the intention is to present controlled changes of program structure variables in a series of paired sequences via kinescope recordings in a closed circuit viewing situation. With this procedure it could be determined how well these changes are perceived by fans and resisters. A list of proposed variations and a suggested respondents' booklet are included in Appendices D and E.

It would be hoped that the knowledge derived from the studies proposed in this report might function to modify educational television program structure and hence to decrease the resistance to educational television which is now present.

Appendix A

Questionnaire and Attitude Items Suggested for Study Proposal IIP

1. Name _____
2. Job Title _____
3. Station _____
4. Number of programs per week for which you serve as producer and/or director? _____
5. Hours at which these programs are broadcast _____

6. What is your age? _____ years

7. What is your marital status? **APPENDICES** check one of the following:

Single _____ Married _____ Divorced _____ Separated _____ Widowed _____

8. How many children have you? Circle number 0 1 2 3 or more

9. What is your approximate annual income from your present job?

- _____ Below \$4,000
- _____ \$4,001-\$5,000
- _____ \$5,001-\$7,500
- _____ \$7,501-\$10,000
- _____ \$10,001-\$12,000
- _____ \$12,001 and more

10. Circle the last year of formal education you have completed.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 1 2 3 4 Graduate Graduate
College Work Degree

11. What political party do you support most frequently? _____

12. What is your religious preference? (Please specify denomination or sect.)

13. How many newspapers do you read regularly? 0 1 2 3 or more

14. What magazines do you read regularly? Please list.

15. What professional journals Appendix A regularly? Please list.

Questionnaire and Attitude Items Suggested for Study Proposal IIB

1. Name _____
2. Job Title _____
3. Station _____
4. Number of programs per week for which you serve as producer and/or director? _____
5. Hours at which these programs are broadcast _____
6. What is your age? _____ years
7. What is your marital status? Please check one of the following:
 Single _____ Married _____ Divorced _____ Separated _____ Widowed _____
8. How many children have you? Circle answer 0 1 2 3 or more
9. What is your approximate annual income from your present job?
 _____ below \$4,000
 _____ \$4,001-5,000
 _____ \$5,001-7,500
 _____ \$7,501-10,000
 _____ \$10,001-12,000
 _____ \$12,001 and above
10. Circle the last year of formal education you have completed.
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 1 2 3 4 Graduate Graduate
 College Work Degree
11. What political party do you support most frequently? _____
12. What is your religious preference? (Please specify demonination or sect.

13. How many newspapers do you read regularly? 0 1 2 3 or more
14. What magazines do you read regularly? Please list.

15. What professional journals do you read regularly? Please list.

16. What professional experience have you had? Please list positions and approximate dates.

17. What professional training have you had?

18. Please list any professional organizations of which you are a member.

19. Have you ever held an office in one of the organizations mentioned in 18 above?

Yes _____ No _____

20. Please list any fraternal or social organizations of which you are a member.

21. Have you ever held an office in one of the organizations mentioned in 20 above?

Yes _____ No _____

22. Please list below, in the order of their importance, the three or four major objectives you strive for in producing television programs:

- a. _____
- _____
- _____
- b. _____
- _____
- _____
- c. _____
- _____
- _____
- d. _____
- _____
- _____

Use reverse side if additional space is required for this answer.

23. We are interested in how you would characterize the audience for your station. We realize that this is a difficult task and ask only that you make the best estimate you can of your station's audience on the following attributes:

a. Size. How many people per 1000 TV viewers would you estimate watched one of your programs last week? _____

b. Sex.

- _____ generally more men
- _____ generally more women
- _____ no sex difference

c. Age.

- _____ tend to be older
- _____ tend to be younger
- _____ mixed

d. Family Size.

- _____ larger families
- _____ smaller families
- _____ no difference

25. e. Occupation. audience response helpful to you in your programming?

- ☐ mostly professional
☐ mostly business
☐ mostly white collar
☐ mostly blue collar
☐ no difference

26. f. Social Class. Your programming because of audience response?

- ☐ mostly upper class
☐ mostly upper middle class
☐ mostly lower middle class
☐ mostly lower class
☐ mixed

27. g. Education. What percentage of your station's audience would you estimate falls into each of the following educational categories?

- ☐ % college
☐ % high school
☐ % grade school
☐ % none

28. h. Television Viewing. How many hours per day would you estimate that the average viewer in your audience watches general television?

_____ hours

29. Have you received any of the following types of audience response either praising or suggesting modifications in your programming?

- a. Solicited or unsolicited mail. Yes _____ No _____
 b. If yes, approximate number per month _____
 c. Telephone calls. Yes _____ No _____
 d. If yes, approximate number per month _____
 e. Personal visits. Yes _____ No _____
 f. If yes, approximate number per month _____
 g. Audience surveys conducted by yourself or by your station.
 Yes _____ No _____
 h. Any other source. If so, please list.

25. Have you found audience response helpful to you in your programming?

- ☐ very helpful
☐ moderately helpful
☐ somewhat helpful
☐ not very helpful

26. Have you modified your programming because of audience response?

- ☐ considerably
☐ moderately
☐ somewhat
☐ no

27. Do you regularly receive programming suggestions from your superiors?

- ☐ yes
☐ no

28. If yes, have these suggestions influenced your programming?

- ☐ considerably
☐ moderately
☐ somewhat
☐ no

29. Do you occasionally receive programming suggestions from your co-workers?

- ☐ yes
☐ no

30. If yes, have these suggestions influenced your programming?

- ☐ considerably
☐ moderately
☐ somewhat
☐ no

31. Describe efforts expended:

a. Studio production equipment

b. Number of film reels

c. Number of slide exposures

d. Slide equipment

e. Number of light reels

f. Lighting control

g. Other (specify) _____

31. We are interested in the factors which you feel either facilitate or inhibit the full realization of the objectives you strive for in producing television programs. Please indicate for the items below whether they tend to facilitate you or tend to inhibit your efforts.

Please check the column which best represents your feelings on every item below.

	Tends to Facilitate	Tends to Inhibit
a. Attitude of boss		
b. Attitude of co-workers		
c. Professional evaluation		
d. Audience response		
e. Station's programming policies		
f. Studio artist		
g. Studio size		
h. Studio height		
i. Set design		
j. Set construction		
k. Number of cameras		
l. Lense complement		
m. Camera mounts		
n. Electronic effects equipment		
o. Studio projection equipment		
p. Number of film chains		
q. Number of slide projectors		
r. Audio equipment		
s. Number of light units		
t. Lighting ucontrol		
u. Other (specify) _____		

Semantic Differential Scales

Instructions

In this section of the questionnaire, we would like to have you rate six concepts against sets of descriptive scales. On each of the following pages you will find a different concept to be judged and beneath it you will find a set of scales. You are to rate the concept on each of the scales in order.

Here is how you are to use these scales:

If you feel that the concept at the top of the page is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should circle the number as follows:

Fair (3) 2 1 0 1 2 3 Unfair

or

Fair 3 2 1 0 1 2 (3) Unfair

If you feel that the concept is quite closely related to one side or the other end of the scale (but not extremely), you should circle the number as follows:

Strong 3 (2) 1 0 1 2 3 Weak

or

Strong 3 2 1 0 1 (2) 3 Weak

If the concept seems only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral), then you should circle the number as follows:

Active 3 2 (1) 0 1 2 3 Passive

or

Active 3 2 1 0 (1) 2 3 Passive

The direction toward which you check, of course, depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seem most characteristic of the thing you're judging.

If you consider the concept to be neutral on the scale, both sides of the scale equally associated with the concept, or if the scale is completely irrelevant, unrelated to the concept, then you should circle the number in the middle:

Safe 3 2 1 (0) 1 2 3 Dangerous

Please do not look back and forth through the items. Make each item a separate and independent judgment. Do not labor over one judgment too long; it is your first impressions, the immediate "feelings" about the items, that we want.

SCALES

MYSELF

Successful	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Unsuccessful
Optimistic	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Pessimistic
Important	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Unimportant
Severe	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Lenient
Free	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Constrained
Active	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Passive
Excitable	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Calm
Cautious	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Rash
Stable	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Changeable
Aggressive	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Defensive

MY JOB

Positive	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Negative
Good	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Bad
Important	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Unimportant
Complete	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Incomplete
Strong	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Weak
Free	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Constrained
Active	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Passive
Interesting	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Boring
Progressive	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Regressive
Usual	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Unusual
Stable	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Changeable

MY STATION

Positive	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Negative
Good	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Bad
Important	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Unimportant
Complete	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Incomplete
Strong	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Weak
Free	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Constrained
Active	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Passive
Interesting	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Boring
Progressive	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Regressive
Usual	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Unusual
Stable	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Changeable

Wise 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 Foolish

MY CO-WORKERS

Successful	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Unsuccessful
Positive	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Negative
Optimistic	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Pessimistic
Strong	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Weak
Severe	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Lenient
Free	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Constrained
Active	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Passive
Excitable	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Calm
Interesting	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Boring
Progressive	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Regressive
Stable	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Changeable
Aggressive	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Defensive

Note: In the questionnaire, these concepts would appear on separate pages and the scales for each would be randomized.

OUR AUDIENCE

Positive	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Negative
Good	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Bad
Optimistic	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Pessimistic
Hard	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Soft
Severe	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Lenient
Heavy	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Light
Active	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Passive
Excitable	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Calm
Cautious	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Rash
Stable	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Changeable
Aggressive	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Defensive
Wise	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Foolish

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

Successful	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Unsuccessful
Good	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Bad
Important	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Unimportant
Complete	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Incomplete
Strong	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Weak
Free	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Constrained
Active	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Passive
Fast	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Slow
Interesting	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Boring
Progressive	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Regressive
Stable	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Changeable
Usual	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	Unusual

Note: In the questionnaire, these concepts would appear on separate pages and the scales for each would be randomized.

Appendix B

Scales for Study Proposal III A

The check list below is designed to help us know how you personally saw the program just presented. Please answer every question. If you aren't sure of the answer, make the best estimate. I like it 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 I dislike it

Clear 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 Confusing

Fast 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 Slow

1. Estimation of number of cameras used during program

Useful for me 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 Useless for me

(a) (Circle one) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 or more

2. Estimation of types of PERFORMERS ON ETV

(a) Of the three types of performers shown, which was the most used? (Circle one)

I like them 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 I dislike them

Clear 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 Confusing

Fast 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 Slow

Makes subject 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 Don't make subject important
important

1. Close up

PRODUCTION QUALITY ON ETV

(b) On the I like it 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 I dislike it

Clear 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 Confusing

3. Estimation of angles of pictures used:

Fast 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 Slow

(a) Of the three types of pictures shown, which was the most used? (Circle one)

Makes subject 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 Doesn't make subject
important important

Note: These scales should be randomized for each concept when they are used in a research design.

1. Full front

11. Side

(b) On the pictures above, mark "1" on the

Appendix C

Viewer's Program Check List

The check list below is designed to help us know how you personally saw the program just presented on your television set. Please answer every question. If you aren't sure of the answer, make the best estimate you can for we are primarily interested in your personal judgments. If you have questions, feel free to ask our representative to help you.

1. Estimation of number of cameras used during program:

(a) (Circle one) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 or more

2. Estimation of types of pictures used:

(a) Of the three types of pictures below, which do you think was the most used? (Circle one)



i. Close up



ii. Medium



iii. Wide

(b) On the pictures above, mark "X" over the one next most used.

3. Estimation of angles of pictures used:

(a) Of the three types of pictures below, which do you think was the most used? (Circle one)



i. Full front



ii. Side



iii. Above

(b) On the pictures above, mark "X" over the one next most used.

4. Estimation of camera movement:

(a) If you observed the camera(s) doing any of the things noted below, check that item:

- i. ☐ Camera(s) moved in and out ii. ☐ Camera(s) moved from side to side
 iii. ☐ Camera(s) moved up and down iv. ☐ None of these
-

5. Estimation of kinds of changes between various pictures used:

(a) On each of the items below, circle the number you feel best describes what happened during the program:

i. Number "cuts" (Instantaneous changes from one picture to another):

(0) (1-4) (5-10) (11-20) (21-40) (41-90) (91 plus)

ii. Number "dissolves" (Slow changes between pictures):

(0) (1-4) (5-10) (11-20) (21-40) (41-90) (91 plus)

iii. Number of "fades" (Screen slowly goes blank):

(0) (1) (2) (3) (4-6) (7-10) (11-20) (21 plus)

iv. Number of "superimposures" (One picture appears over another):

(0) (1) (2) (3) (4-6) (7-10) (11-20) (21 plus)

6. Estimation of lighting:

(a) Would you characterize the lighting used on the program?

i. ☐ Mostly dark iii. ☐ Some of each

ii. ☐ Mostly bright iv. ☐ No noticeable characteristic

7. Estimation of setting:

(a) Was the action mostly: i. ☐ indoors ii. ☐ outdoors?

(b) Did the set look like: i. ☐ real place ii. ☐ make believe place?

8. Kinds of visual material used? the appeal of the performer(s)?

(a) Check below the items you saw used during the program:

- | | |
|--|---|
| i. ☐ motion picture films | v. ☐ objects |
| ii. ☐ still pictures | vi. ☐ photographic projections |
| iii. ☐ maps, charts, graphs | within studio |
| iv. ☐ blackboards | vii. ☐ cartoons or other animated pictures |

9. Estimation of use of music:

(a) How was music used in the program you viewed? (Check as many as appropriate)

- | | |
|--|--|
| i. ☐ Not used | iv. ☐ As background |
| ii. ☐ In introduction and close | v. ☐ As musical performance |
| iii. ☐ As transitions | within program |

10. Approximately how much time would you estimate was devoted to talking on the program?

(a) Check that which is closest to your estimate:

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| i. ☐ 0 to 5 per cent | iii. ☐ 30 per cent | v. ☐ 70 per cent |
| ii. ☐ 15 per cent | iv. ☐ 50 per cent | vi. ☐ 100 per cent |

11. Estimations regarding performers on the program:

(a) How many people participated?

- | | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| i. ☐ one | ii. ☐ two | iii. ☐ three | iv. ☐ four |
| v. ☐ five or more | | | |

(b) Were most of the participants

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| i. ☐ males | ii. ☐ females | iii. ☐ about equal number of each |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|

(c) How would you characterize the age group of the performer(s)?

- | | | |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
| i. ☐ juvenile | iii. ☐ young adult | v. ☐ aged |
| ii. ☐ adolescent | iv. ☐ adult | |

(d) How would you characterize the appeal of the performer(s)?

1. _____ unattractive ii. _____ average iii. _____ attractive

(e) How would you classify the clothing worn by the performer(s)?

1. _____ conventional dress ii. _____ costume iii. _____ combination

(f) How much verbal exchange between performers would you say took place during this program?

1. _____ much exchange ii. _____ average exchange iii. _____ little exchange

(g) How much movement of the performer(s) took place during the program?

1. _____ much movement ii. _____ average movement iii. _____ little movement

12. Estimation of emotional impact of the program on you:

(a) Did you find the program exciting and stimulating?

III. Camera

	Very much		About average		Not very much
(a) Yes	7	6	5	4	3
(b) No					2
(c) Yes					1
(d) No					
(e) Both of the above					

IV. Camera Angles

(a) 45 degree	vs.	No angle (0 degree)
(b) 90 degree	vs.	No angle (0 degree)
(c) 90 degree	vs.	45 degree

V. Transitions

(a) All cuts vs. All dissolves

(b) BOTH: In addition to the above, and in order to test other forms of transitions, it would be necessary to design a program differently in each case. Specifically, a program would need to be designed which made use of only one transition during the presentation. With content held constant, it would then be appropriate to make use of cuts, dissolves, fades, and superimpositions for the required transitions.

Appendix D

Variables Proposed for Study III C

The list below is suggested as those items which are thought to be amenable to controlled experimentation in the suggested study III C. As was noted in the text, inverting the order of presentation of each item in a second presentation during the session could serve as a reliability check. The variables suggested are appropriate to the studio facilities at the University of Oregon; depending upon equipment, other (or additional) production variables might be more appropriate elsewhere.

CONDITION ONE		CONDITION TWO	
<u>I. Number of cameras used:</u>			
(a) One camera	vs.	Two cameras	
<u>II. Type of lenses used:</u>			
(a) Wide angle (35 mm)	vs.	Normal (90 mm)	
(b) Telephoto (135 mm)	vs.	Normal (90 mm)	
(c) Telephoto (135 mm)	vs.	Wide angle (35 mm)	
<u>III. Camera Movement:</u>			
(a) Dolly	vs.	Truck	
(b) Pan	vs.	Tilt	
(c) Truck	vs.	Pan	
(d) Dolly	vs.	Pan	
(e) Each of the above	vs.	No movement	
<u>IV. Camera Angles:</u>			
(a) 45 degree	vs.	No angle (0 degree)	
(b) 90 degree	vs.	No angle (0 degree)	
(c) 90 degree	vs.	45 degree	
<u>V. Transitions:</u>			
(a) All cuts	vs.	All dissolves	
(b) NOTE: In addition to the above, and in order to test other forms of transitions, it would be necessary to proceed somewhat differently in each case. Specifically, content would need to be designed which made use of only <u>one</u> transition during the presentation. With content held constant, it would then be appropriate to make use of cuts, dissolves, fades, and superimpositions for the required transitions.			

VI. Lighting:

(a) High key vs. Low key

VII. Background:

(a) Indoor vs. Outdoor
(b) Representational vs. Stylized

VIII. Music:

(a) Used in introduction vs. Not used
(b) Used in close vs. Not used
(c) Used in transitions vs. Not used
(d) Used as background vs. Not used

Circle last grade completed: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17+
Grade and High School College Graduate School

(PAGE ONE)

1. Did you see any difference between program unit one and program unit two?

____ Yes, see a difference

____ No, did not see a difference

DO NOT TURN THE PAGE UNTIL YOU ARE REQUESTED TO DO SO

(PAGE TWO)

2. If you answered "yes" to the question on the preceding page, briefly note what the difference was that you observed.

The difference between one and two was _____

DO NOT TURN THE PAGE UNTIL YOU ARE REQUESTED TO DO SO

DO NOT TURN THE PAGE UNTIL YOU ARE REQUESTED TO DO SO

(PAGE THREE)

3. One of the following conditions was true in connection with the two program units you just viewed. Check the item below which you feel is most correct.

- (a) _____ The first program unit used more cameras than the second program unit.
- (b) _____ The second program unit used more cameras than the first program unit.
- (c) _____ There was no difference in the number of cameras used in the two program units.

DO NOT TURN THE PAGE UNTIL YOU ARE REQUESTED TO DO SO